REMARKS

[0001] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-107 are currently pending
- Claims 14, 48, 72, 76 and 90 are canceled herein
- Claims 91-107 are withdrawn herein (Applicant respectfully submits that there is a typographical error on page 2 of the Office Action where the Office indicates "[c]laims 91-103 are withdrawn" while in the Office Action Summary it is indicated that claims 91-107 are withdrawn)
- Claims 1, 15, 49, 73 and 77 are amended herein

[0002] Support for the amendments to claims 1, 15, 49, 73 and 77 can be found in the specification at least at paragraphs [0222] through [0229]. Claims 14, 48, 72, 76 and 90 are canceled without prejudice in view of the amendments to claims 1, 15, 49, 73 and 77.

Cited Documents

[0003] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- **Taymans**: Taymans, et al., "GStreamer Application Development Manual", retrieved on 9-22-2009 at http://www.gstreamer.net/docs/gstreamer-manual.pdf, Archived 4-5-2003, pp i-iv and 1-84

- **Thompson**: Thompson, "DirectShow for Media Playback In Windows", retrieved on 9-22-2009 at http://www.flipcode.com/archives/DirectShow_For_Media_Playback_In_Windows-Part_I_Basics.shtml, Parts 1-3, Last Part Dated 9-13-200, 18 pages
- **Blome**: Blome, et al., "Core Media Technology in Windows XP Empowers You to Create Custom Audio/Video Processing Components", retrieved on 9-22-2009 at http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/magazine/cc301631.aspx, MSDN Magazine, 16 pages
- **Smith**: "EvCode.h", retrieved on 9-22-2009 at http://www.lelandnsmith.com/downloads/Microsoft/DirectX%209%20SDK/sdk/Include/evcode.h, Microsoft, 2001, pp 1-6
- **GCRM**: "GstEvent", retrieved on 9-22-2009 at http://www.gstreamer.net/docs/gstreamer/gstreamer-bstevent.html, GStreamer Core Reference Manual, Archived 4-29-2003, pp 1-14
- **MSDN**: "IFileSourceFilter Interface", retrieved on 9-22-2009 at http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/dd389981(VS.85,printer).aspx, MSDN, Microsoft, 7-13-2009, 4 pages

Claims 1-9, 14, 49-51, 53-64 and 69-76 Are Not Disclosed by Taymans

[0004] Claims 1-9, 14, 49-51, 53-64 and 69-76 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Taymans. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 1

[0005] Claim 1, as amended, defines a system that comprises:

- a media engine embodied on the one or more computer-readable media and configured to communicatively interact with an application to present a presentation on a first computing device that is remote from a second computing device on which the media engine resides

- the media engine being configured to use: one or more media sources individual ones of which serving as a source of media content; one or more transforms communicatively linked with the one or more media sources and configured to operate on data received from the one or more media sources; and one or more media sinks configured to sink a media stream

[0006] It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over Taymans for at least the reasons stated below.

[0007] Taymans is an application development manual for GStreamer, which is a framework for creating streaming media applications. More specifically, Taymans discloses that GStreamer provides a set of tools for application programmers to create media pipelines without writing a single line of code (p. 5, bullet 1), and that GStreamer also provides an API for plug-in programmers to create self contained plug-ins with extensive debugging and tracing mechanism (p. 5, bullet 2). Taymans discloses source elements, filter elements and sink elements with pads as link points (pp. 9-10). The source elements generate data for use by a pipeline, and that source elements do not accept data as source elements only generate data (p. 9). The filter elements operate on data they receive in their sink pads and produce data on their source pads (p. 9). The sink elements are terminal points in a media pipeline and they accept data but do not produce anything (p. 10). Taymans further discloses a disk source element, filesrc, to read from a file (p. 32), and that the filesrc element can be replaced with an httpsrc element, which provides instant network streaming (p. 34).

[0008] Accordingly, both "filesrc" and "httpsrc" as disclosed in Taymans are source elements that generate data for use by a pipeline. In the case of "filesrc", the source of data is a file and, in the case of "httpsrc", the source of data is across a network. That is, with "httpsrc", the source of data may be separated by a network from where the data is processed and where the data is presented. However, "httpsrc" merely indicates a source of data in a pipeline and cannot be said to be a media engine itself. A source element is not the same as or equivalent to a media engine as the term "media engine" is known in the art. The fact that the source of data may be across a network from where the data is presented has nothing to do with whether a media engine is remote from where the data is presented. Therefore, "httpsrc" does not disclose and is irrelevant to whether a presentation is presented on a first computing device that is remote from a second computing device on which a media engine resides.

[0009] The Office takes the position that Taymans, by disclosing "httpsrc" on page 34, "discloses the media engine is configured to present a presentation on a computing device that is remote from a computing device on which the media engine resides (httpsrc, p. 34)" (Office Action, p. 5). However, as explained above, it is respectfully submitted that Taymans does not disclose the media engine is configured to present a presentation on a computing device that is remote from a computing device on which the media engine resides. Therefore, Taymans fails to disclose "a media engine embodied on the one or more computer-readable media and configured to communicatively interact with an application to present a presentation on a first computing device that is remote from a second computing device on which the media engine resides" as presently recited in amended claim 1.

[0010] Therefore, independent claim 1 is patentable over Taymans. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 49

[0011] Claim 49, as amended, defines a system that comprises:

- a media engine embodied on the one or more computer-readable media and configured to communicatively interact with an application to present a presentation, the media engine being configured to use a media session, the media engine and the media session configured to present the presentation on a first computing device that is remote from a second computing device on which the media engine and the media session reside

- the media session being configured to use: one or more media sources individual ones of which serving as a source of media content; one or more transforms communicatively linked with one or more media sources and configured to operate on data received from the one or more media sources; and one or more media sinks configured to sink a media stream

[0012] These features are similar to the features recited by claim 1, although the scopes of claim 1 and claim 49 are different. For the reasons explained above with respect to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Taymans also fails to disclose the features of claim 49 as amended. Accordingly, independent claim 49 is patentable over Taymans. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 73

[0013] Claim 73, as amended, defines a system that comprises:

- a media engine embodied on the one or more computer-readable media and configured to communicatively interact with an application to present a presentation, the media engine being configured to use a media session, the media engine and the media session configured to present the presentation on a first computing device that is remote from a second computing device on which the media engine and the media session reside

- the media session being configured to use at least one media processor, one or more bit pumps communicatively linked with the media processor, and one or more media sinks communicatively linked with respective bit pumps

- the media processor being configured to use one or more media sources and one or more transforms communicatively linked with one or more media sources and configured to operate on data received from the one or more media sources

[0014] These features are similar to the features recited by claim 1, although the scopes of claim 1 and claim 73 are different. For the reasons explained above with respect to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Taymans also fails to disclose the features of claim 73 as amended. Accordingly, independent claim 73 is patentable over Taymans. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 73 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 2-9, 14, 50-51, 53-64, 69-72 and 74-76

[0015] As claims 14, 72 and 76 have been canceled the rejection of claims 14, 72 and 76 is moot.

[0016] Claims 2-9, 50-51, 53-64, 69-71 and 74-75 are patentable over Taymans because of their dependency on patentable claims 1, 49 and 73, respectively. Further, each of claims 2-9, 50-51, 53-64, 69-71 and 74-75 includes additional features that, when taken together with those of claims 1, 49 and 73, respectively, defines a system not disclosed by Taymans.

[0017] Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 2-9, 14, 50-51, 53-64, 69-72 and 74-76 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 77-82, 85, 86 and 88-90 Are Not Disclosed by Thompson

[0018] Claims 77-82, 85, 86 and 88-90 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Thompson. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 77

[0019] Claim 77, as amended, defines a system that comprises:

- a media engine embodied on the one or more computer-readable media and configured to communicatively interact with an application to present a presentation on a first computing device that is remote from a second computing device on which the media engine resides

- the media engine being configured to use: one or more media sources individual ones of which serving as a source of media content; one or more transforms communicatively linked with the one or more media sources and configured to operate on data received from the one or more media sources; and one or more media sinks configured to sink a media stream

[0020] It is respectfully submitted that claim 77 is allowable over Thompson for at least the reasons stated below.

[0021] Thompson pertains to DirectShow for media playback in Windows®. More specifically, Thompson discloses DirectShow as a media streaming layer on top of DirectX to handle pretty much any type of media (p. 1). In the Filter Graph Editor, each box represents a filter and arrows connecting boxes represent the output of one filter being passed to the input of another filter (p. 2). To play a .WAV file from a website, the 'File Source (URL)' is used (p. 17).

[0022] Accordingly, the file source (URL) as disclosed in Thompson is a source of data for streaming media. That is, the source of data may be separate by a network from where the data is processed and where the data is presented. However, having an URL as the file source says nothing about a media engine that can: use one or more

media sources individual ones of which serving as a source of media content; use one or more transforms communicatively linked with the one or more media sources; and operate on data received from the one or more media sources. The URL file source itself is not the same as or equivalent to a media engine as the term "media engine" is known in the art. The fact that the file source is a URL has nothing to do with whether a media engine is remote from where the data is presented. Therefore, having a URL as the file source does not disclose and is irrelevant to whether a presentation is presented on a first computing device that is remote from a second computing device on which a media engine resides.

[0023] The Office takes the position that Thompson, by disclosing a URL as the file source on page 17, "teaches the media engine is configured to present a presentation on a computing device that is remote from a computing device on which the media engine resides (p. 17, file source is a URL)" (Office Action, p. 9). However, as explained above, it is respectfully submitted that Thompson does not disclose the media engine is configured to present a presentation on a computing device that is remote from a computing device on which the media engine resides. Therefore, Thompson fails to disclose "a media engine embodied on the one or more computer-readable media and configured to communicatively interact with an application to present a presentation on a first computing device that is remote from a second computing device on which the media engine resides" as presently recited in amended claim 77.

[0024] Accordingly, independent claim 77 is patentable over Thompson. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 77 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 78-82, 85, 86 and 88-90

[0025] As claim 90 has been canceled the rejection of claim 90 is moot.

[0026] Claims 78-82, 85, 86 and 88-89 are patentable over Thompson because of their dependency on patentable claim 77. Further, each of claims 78-82, 85, 86 and 88-89 includes additional features that, when taken together with those of claim 77, defines a system not disclosed by Thompson.

[0027] Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 78-82, 85, 86 and 88-90 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Claim 52 Is Not Obvious Over Taymans

[0028] Claim 52 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Taymans. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

[0029] As explained above, Taymans fails to teach or suggest all of the elements and features of independent claims 49, from which claim 52 depends. Accordingly, claim 52 is believed to be patentable over Taymans because of its dependency on patentable claim 49. Further, claim 52 includes additional features that, when taken together with those of claim 49, defines a system not taught or suggested by Taymans. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 87 Is Not Obvious Over Taymans

[0030] Claim 87 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Thompson. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

[0031] As explained above, Taymans fails to teach or suggest all of the elements and features of independent claims 77, from which claim 87 depends. Accordingly, claim 87 is believed to be patentable over Taymans because of its dependency on patentable claim 77. Further, claim 87 includes additional features that, when taken together with those of claim 77, defines a system not taught or suggested by Taymans. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 87 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 10-13, 15-36, 41, 43, 47 and 48 Are Not Obvious Over The Cited Art

[0032] Claims 10-13, 15-36, 41, 43, 47 and 48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Taymans and further in view of Blome, with MSDN cited as evidence regarding Blome. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 15

[0033] Claim 15, as amended, defines a system that comprises:

- a media engine embodied on the one or more computer-readable media and configured to communicatively interact with an application to present a presentation on a first computing device that is remote from a second computing device on which the media engine resides

- the media engine being configured to a provide plurality of open methods that can be called by an application to specify data sources in different manners, the media engine being configured to use: one or more media sources individual ones of which serving as a source of media content; one or more transforms communicatively linked with one or more media sources and configured to operate on data received from the one or more media sources; and one or more media sinks configured to sink a media stream

[0034] These features are similar to the features recited by claim 1, although the scopes of claim 1 and claim 15 are different. For the reasons explained above with respect to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Taymans also fails to disclose the features of claim 15 as amended.

[0035] Blome is directed to DirectShow, which is an API that enables Window applications to control a wide variety of audio/video input devices. The Office states that "Taymans does not explicitly disclose a plurality of open methods", but takes position that "Blome discloses a similar media engine that calls a RenderFile method (p. 3, paragraphs describing Figs. 1 and 2)" (Office Action, p. 11).

[0036] As explained above, Taymans fails to teach or suggest all of the elements and features of independent claims 1 and 15. Blome fails to remedy such deficiencies. For example, there is no teaching or suggestion in Blome of "a media engine embodied on the one or more computer-readable media and configured to communicatively interact with an application to present a presentation on a first computing device that is remote from a second computing device on which the media engine resides" as presently recited in amended claim 1 (and hence claims 10-13). Blome also fails to teach or suggest "providing access to the allocated processing resources for execution of the task by sending a reply communication to the client associated with the first communication, wherein the client is awakened when the processing resources have been allocated" as presently recited in amended claim 15 (and hence claims 16-36, 41, 43 and 47).

[0037] Thus, Taymans and Blome, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the elements and features of independent claims 1 and 15.

Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 15 are patentable over Taymans and further in view of Blome. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(3) be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 10-13

[0038] Claims 10-13 are patentable over the cited references because of their dependency on patentable claim 1. Further, each of claims 10-13 includes additional features that, when taken together with those of claim 1, defines a system not disclosed by the cited references.

[0039] Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 16-36, 41, 43, 47 and 48

[0040] As claim 48 has been canceled the rejection of claim 48 is moot.

[0041] Claims 16-36, 41, 43 and 47 are patentable over the cited references because of their dependency on patentable claim 15. Further, each of claims 16-36, 41, 43 and 47 includes additional features that, when taken together with those of claim 15, defines a system not disclosed by the cited references.

[0042] Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 16-36, 41, 43, 47 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 37-40, 42 and 44-46 Are Not Obvious Over The Cited Art

[0043] Claims 37-40, 42 and 44-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Taymans and Blome, and further in view of Smith. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

[0044] Smith is directed to system-defined event codes. The Office states that "Taymans and Blome do not teach an event associated with a completion of an open method", but takes position that "Smith discloses events for a media engine including an event associated with a completion of an open method (pp. 2-3, EC_OPENING_FILE)" (Office Action, p. 14).

[0045] As explained above, the combination of Taymans and Blome fails to teach or suggest all of the elements and features of independent claim 15, from which claims 37-40, 42 and 44-46 depend. Smith fails to remedy such deficiencies. For example, there is no teaching or suggestion in Smith of "providing access to the allocated processing resources for execution of the task by sending a reply communication to the client associated with the first communication, wherein the client is awakened when the processing resources have been allocated" as presently recited in amended claim 15 (and hence claims 37-40, 42 and 44-46).

[0046] Thus, Taymans, Blome and Smith, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the elements and features of independent claim 15. Accordingly, independent claim 15 is patentable over Taymans and Blome and further in view of Smith.

[0047] Claims 37-40, 42 and 44-46 are believed to be patentable over the cited references because of their respective dependency on patentable claim 15. Further,

each of claims 37-40, 42 and 44-46 includes additional features that, when taken together with those of claim 15, defines a not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 37-40, 42 and 44-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 65-68 Are Not Obvious Over The Cited Art

[0048] Claims 65-68 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Taymans and further in view of Smith. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

[0049] As explained above, Taymans fails to teach or suggest all of the elements and features of independent claim 49, from which claims 65-68 depend. Smith fails to remedy such deficiencies. For example, there is no teaching or suggestion in Smith of "a media engine embodied on the one or more computer-readable media and configured to communicatively interact with an application to present a presentation, the media engine being configured to use a media session, the media engine and the media session configured to present the presentation on a first computing device that is remote from a second computing device on which the media engine and the media session reside" as presently recited in amended claim 49 (and hence claims 65-68).

[0050] Thus, Taymans and Smith, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the elements and features of independent claim 49. Accordingly, independent claim 49 is patentable over Taymans and further in view of Smith.

[0051] Claims 65-68 are believed to be patentable over the cited references because of their respective dependency on patentable claim 49. Further, each of claims 65-68

includes additional features that, when taken together with those of claim 49, defines a not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 65-68 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 83 and 84 Are Not Obvious Over The Cited Art

[0052] Claims 83 and 84 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Thompson and further in view of Blome. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

[0053] As explained above, Thompson fails to teach or suggest all of the elements and features of independent claim 77, from which claims 83 and 84 depend. Blome fails to remedy such deficiencies. For example, there is no teaching or suggestion in Smith of "a media engine embodied on the one or more computer-readable media and configured to communicatively interact with an application to present a presentation on a first computing device that is remote from a second computing device on which the media engine resides" as presently recited in amended claim 77 (and hence claims 83 and 84).

[0054] Thus, Thompson and Blome, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the elements and features of independent claim 77. Accordingly, independent claim 77 is patentable over Thompson and further in view of Blome.

[0055] Claims 83 and 84 are believed to be patentable over the cited references because of their respective dependency on patentable claim 77. Further, each of claims 83 and 84 includes additional features that, when taken together with those of claim 77, defines a not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, it is

respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 83 and 84 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

[0056] Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Andy M. Han, Reg. No. 60,266/ Dated: January 22, 2010
Andy M. Han (andyh@leehayes.com; 206-876-6006)
Registration No. 60266

Damon J. Kruger
Registration No. 60400